

**From:** Zachary McCord  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/24/02 11:41pm  
**Subject:** Insufficient Microsoft antitrust action

I am deeply concerned about the limited effects of the antitrust action against Microsoft Corporation. I believe the current PFJ leaves a number of loopholes that Microsoft Corporation may be able to use to reduce the effects of the PFJ

\*The PFJ's definition of "middleware" includes Outlook Express, but fails to include the more powerful Outlook application and Microsoft Office itself, despite the fact that Office contains applications that fit the definition of middleware. The PFJ also allows Microsoft to negate the effects of the sections pertaining to middleware by changing version numbers, and would not cover new versions of Microsoft software. It also does refer to Microsoft java, but does not refer to Microsoft.net and C#, both of which are intended by Microsoft to replace the aforementioned Microsoft Java application.

\*The PFJ's definition of API is too narrow to include certain key Microsoft APIs such as Windows installation APIs.

\*The PFJ's definition of "Windows" does not include Windows 2000 (as opposed to Windows 2000 Professional), Windows XP Tablet PC Edition and Windows CE. Many applications need little or no alteration to be used in other Microsoft platforms.

\*The PFJ gives no real means of enforcement.

\*The PFJ requires vendors of competing middleware to meet 'reasonable technical requirements' seven months before new releases of Windows, yet it does not require Microsoft to disclose those requirements in advance. This allows Microsoft to bypass all competing middleware simply by changing the requirements shortly before the deadline, and not informing ISVs.

Zachary McCord, Student